

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/591,450	MULLEJANS ET AL.	
	Examiner Ginger T. Chapman	Art Unit 3761	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ginger T. Chapman. (3) Suzin C. Bailey.  
 (2) Harvey B. Jacobson, Jr.. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 27 September 2011.

Type:  Telephonic  Video Conference  
 Personal [copy given to:  applicant  applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:  Yes  No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Issues Discussed  101  112  102  103  Others

(For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)

Claim(s) discussed: 1,25-27 and 32.

Identification of prior art discussed: US 7,722,586 (Mullejans) and 7,470,263 (Strobech).

#### Substance of Interview

(For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc...)

During a telephone call with Applicants' representatives, it was noted that the pending claims are in condition for allowance as per the previous Office action of mail date 30 August 2010 except for the presence of claims 25-27, withdrawn with traverse as drawn to a nonelected invention; cancelation of claims 25-27 by way of examiner's amendment was authorized. The discussion continued on the ODP rejections of claims 1 and 22 as unpatentable over claim 11 of '586; claim 1 as unpatentable over claim 1 of '263, it was noted that the instant claims as amended and drawn to inner bag liners having release liners having alignment elements for aligning inner and outer bags with each other serve to distinguish over '586 claims drawn to coupling systems for base plates and adhesive wafers providing releasable sealing surfaces adapted for joining all appliance components to a wearer; and also distinguish over '263 claims drawn to providing coupling systems having barrier elements, filters and outlets, thus the instant and issued claims are drawn to distinct subject matter, inventive concepts and technical features. Accordingly, the obviousness-type double patenting rejections made of record in the previous Office action are withdrawn.

**Applicant recordation instructions:** It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of interview.

**Examiner recordation instructions:** Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recordation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recordation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.

Attachment

/Ginger T Chapman/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3761

/Tatyana Zalukaeva/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3761